

Gift of the
CHRISTIANITY AND WAR



BY

REVEREND HENRY C. KINNEY

M. A. Columbia University, 1861



Presentation Copy

711 West Forty-Seventh Street
Chicago, Illinois



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/christianitywar00kinn>

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR.

BY

REVEREND HENRY C. KINNEY,

M. A. Columbia University, 1861.

War has ever been so common, that a Christian might think it would be easy to find in Public Libraries many treatises, sermons and articles bearing upon the above mentioned subject of the relation of Christianity to war; but this is not the case. I could not find, for instance, that since about the beginning of the 5th Century, much had been written upon either the sinfulness of war or the religious duty to make war. I could not find that anyone had examined, verse by verse, every book in the New Testament to find every passage bearing upon war, directly or indirectly. When such search is made the result of its investigation must, I think, lead most persons to conclude that Christ sanctioned war; that as, in the Epistles, most of the Christian duties are taught through similes, drawn from military life, the life of the camp must have been considered a most honorable vocation; and that from the records of Holy Wars in the book of Revelation, much can be learned about earthly conflicts.

Having examined the New Testament without one direct reference to the Old Testament, as St. Augustine is the greatest of all teachers on the subject, I have referred to his opinions. To this has been added an argument on the sinfulness of all war. That has been followed by an abstract of a philosophical article on war, which can be better read in the Catholic Encyclopedia, from which it was taken. My investigation has demanded about three months study. So far as I know, the Scriptural part is an entirely new research.

We open our New Testament at the gospel of St. Luke at the 13th verse of the 3d chapter. St. John the Baptist, was baptizing in the river Jordan and both individuals and classes came to him, from whom that forerunner of Christ demanded "Fruits meet for repentance." And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying "and what shall we do?" And he said unto them "Do violence unto no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages." As Augustine has so wisely said in substance "if they were to be content with their wages,

then they would have been supposed to have remained soldiers." At the interlapping of the old and new, "the friend of the bridegroom," thought that the profession of a soldier was not incompatible with a good religious penitent life, even though the army had its own peculiar temptations, which were to be resisted. Did Jesus Christ, the bridegroom, throw any stigma upon the occupation? In the gospels and in the Acts, outside of the chosen 12, there is no class of people more highly honored, both by utterance and spiritual gifts conferred, than are members of the army. Whom but a Roman officer would have ever thought of saying (Mt. 8:8) "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me, and I say to this man, go, and he goeth, and to another, come, and he cometh." It was the teaching of a wide army experience that lead the centurion at the Cross and those with him, to say, according to two of the evangelists, "This is the Son of God" and according to St. Luke, "Certainly this was a righteous man." If we turn to the book of The Acts of the Holy Apostles, we find in the 10th Chapter the account of the baptism of Cornelius, the centurion of the Italian band, by St. Peter; in the 23d Chapter how St. Paul's life was saved at considerable inconvenience to the Roman soldiery, at Jerusalem; and in the 27th Chapter, of the courtesy of the centurion Julius to the same great missionary apostle. The eunuch who was the treasurer of Queen Candace of Ethiopia, whom St. Philip baptized, (Acts. 8:39) was probably a military officer. So was that "royal officer," the nobleman of Capernaum, an early convert, spoken of in St. John. The jailer at Philippi (Acts. 16, 25-33) was a common soldier. The one who ran and filled a sponge with the vinegar (which was the only drink which those on military duty were allowed to carry by the Roman authorities) was one of the common rank and file of soldiers (Mt. 26-49). When he ran to moisten the lips of the one who, dying, cried "I Thirst" (Jn. 19:29), how he shamed those who think in our day that soldiers are proverbially and necessarily cruel. Surely we cannot find in gospel or Acts such dissent from St. John the Baptist, as to lead one to think that the military life was a discreditable one to Christ.

With this conviction let us return to our New Testament. At almost the opening pages of the gospel, according to St. Matthew, we find the "Sermon on the Mount." In early Christian ages, after the year 325, passages are taken from it, such as "resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (5:39), and "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you" (verse 44), and have been used as condemnatory of all anger and all resistance of evil by force. But what do such passages mean? Christ's life is in one sense explanatory of his teachings. When a congregation in a synagogue was unwilling to have a man with a withered hand, restored to strength on a sabbath day (Mk. 3:5) we are told "that he looked around on them in anger." When the apostles would have prevented young children from being brought

to him, he was moved with indignation (Mk. 10:13, R. V.). When St. Peter in Mt. 16:23 would have prevented his Master from going to his sacrificial death, Christ called his apostle "a stumbling block;" and likened him to Satan. In the 35 verses of the 23d Chapter of Matthew, each verse carries one of the most seathing pieces of sarcasm and denunciation in the pages of the Bible. Read any of the four accounts of the cleansing of the temple. Think of that young man making a whip of small cords and, with it, driving out of the temple courts sheep, oxen, and men. See him returning to overturn the tables of the money changers, and to prevent anything being carried through his Father's house. When we read, in Jn. 18:22, of Christ being struck in the face at his trial before Caiaphas, he did not turn the other side of his face to the smiter, but he said, probably in indignant tones "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil, but if well, why smitest thou me?" If our conception of Jesus is one founded only on a person living up to the Beatitudes, without any grasp of force and punishment, it is one which is not a conception of his whole character. When St. Paul was struck in the face about 30 years later, at the command of the High Priest (Acts 23:2), the author of that classic on charity called his judge "a whitened wall, whom God would smite." Read Acts 5:1-11; 8:23; 13:10-11; 19:15-17 and see how the Apostles acted.

Christ's life shows that such admonition as we find in the Sermon on the Mount are not Christian statutes, to be always literally obeyed, but that they are inward principles always to be remembered, even when authority must direct severe judgments. If the occupation of a soldier is to be condemned because of them, so must also the business of the criminal judge, the policeman and the jailer. It is a curious fact that, while several of the Ante-Nicene writers condemned the use of arms, the only one who associated the condemnation with the fact of killing was Lactantius, the latest of such writers. In his opinion, the bearing arms and the giving of testimony against a criminal, in a case where punishment was death, was equally wrong for a Christian to do because both placed life in danger. Can any state live which would permit God to be the only punisher of criminals?

The Sermon on the Mount ends with the 7th chapter of Matthew.

In the 10th chapter of that gospel in the 34th verse we read "think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father." In this passage that analogy with army life which runs all through the New Testament is first drawn by Christ, but it is not its first use in the volume. Simeon told the Virgin Mother when she presented her son in the temple (St. Luke 2:35) "that a sword should pierce through her own soul." In Christ's words we have the picture of the new teaching as one dividing the household, which must be followed at whatever consequences to the unity in the family.

In the 29th verse of the 12th chapter, the words are "How can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man?" Christ associated his victory over the power of evil with the use of physical force in compelling submission. Have we not here the method which the State must always follow, or at least have always an inherent right to follow in overcoming evil? St. Peter, in the 2d chapter of his first epistle, writes in a passage which St. Paul strengthens, "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake"—"to governors as sent by him, for vengeance (R. V.) on evil doers, and for praise to them that do well." How can that terror be exerted as a restraining influence upon evil-doing, coming upon ruled and ruler from without, unless the State is backed by force or by an army? But when the State calls out her armies in war, and the members have fastened on themselves an extra hazard of losing life, does that make war wrong? In six places in the gospel Mt. 10:39 and 16:25, Mk. 8:35, Lk. 9:24 and 17:33 and in Jn. 12:25 is an axiom of Christ's spoken on four different occasions and recorded by each of the Evangelists. No other saying of our Saviour has been so honored as the truth which in the first passage mentioned takes the form—for this varies—of "He that findeth his life, shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." If there is a duty presented to any follower of Christ, that duty should be done, whatever the sacrifice demanded. If duty requires from any a sacrifice which will be followed by the loss of our physieal life, it must be lost. Physieal life, not some symholic life was the life, such as all now live. And it was that life which was frequently martyred for three centuries, and that life which suffered some disadvantages, of which he spoke when he said, "he that hateth not his life (Lk. 14:26) cannot be my disciple." An argument against war, when war would be duty if it had no risk of life, is one which runs contrary to the most honored saying of Christ. Upon the slaughtered body of martyrs was Christ's ehureh reared. War and martyrdom have this in common that both accomplish their end, through loss of life sacrificed through a sense of duty.

To at least 600,000 Americans, out of over nine millions, there should be not one doubt, either as to what is their duty or what is the will of God for each one. Here I shall use my only direct reference to the Old Testament. It is taken from Prov. 16:33. It reads, "The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of Jehovah." When, at Washington, a blind-folded man took out of a globe, and another called, say the number 101 and did not call before or afterwards No. 100, every holder of that ehosen number in every registration district in the United States should hear the voice of God, before which, individual choice, or pleading of relatives, or the fear of death, should bow.

In Lk. 14:31-32 there is a very warlike simile "What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first and consulteth whether he is able, with 10,000 troops, to meet

him that cometh against him with 20,000, or else, he sendeth an embassy, and desireth conditions of peace." Here Christ's view of war is not that of a teacher judging it to be wrong, because of loss of life and destruction of property, but has, for its sole consideration, whether the sacrifices would accomplish its objects, or lead to greater disaster. Its concluding words are "Whosoever it be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." The seeming necessity for war was more fully elaborated in many ways during that last week of Christ's life which he spent at Jerusalem. Before entering upon last words and incidents, permit me to refer to words uttered at a little earlier date. They can be found in Mt. 18:7 and are referred to in Lk. 17:1 "Woe unto the world because of offenses. For it needs be that offenses come," or as St. Luke writes "It is impossible but that offenses will come."

The offenses which excited the words were done, it is implied, to little children. St. Matthew carries forward his words by directing the offender to cut off the offending hand or foot, and through St. Luke by directing the offended to forgive, for 7 times each day, the offender; but there are offenses against these little ones, which both individuals and the State must punish by either a long period of life in prison or by death. But if offenses are natural in the world for individuals, it is as impossible for the State, as it is for individuals, not to meet them. Who is to adjudicate upon the wrongs of the injured party when there is a national offense continually repeated? There was a time, not long since, when Christians were saying "War will never again be waged." International law, friendly diplomats from foreign lands, treaties of peace, bonds of commerce, a constant interchange of immigration, would, with talks in the Peace Palace in The Hague, always prevent it. Twenty powers additional to four others, have in the last three years, contrary to their previous opinion, found their only protection for peace, was in the declaration of war. Their only dread now is that it may be forgotten that Napoleon was sent to Elba, in May 1814, to return to the mainland in February 1815, and to lead hostile forces in June of that year at Waterloo. Let us now search the last pages of the gospels for words and incidents, bearing on the relation of Christianity to War.

In the last part of the 21st chapter of Matthew there is a parable. At the conclusion of a story about the killing of the son by tenants who grasped the estate, Jesus turned to the bystanders, who, it is implied, did not think of Jesus as a Nathan (2 Sam. 12), and asked them "what shall he, the owner and Father, do to those hnsbandmen?" The reply was "he will miserably destroy those wicked men." To that moral conclusion, Christ, by silence, gave consent and sanctioned war, and that without one single suggestion of forgiveness and letting the murderers have another chance to steal and murder. Not one bystander could have thought that he was speaking of a heavenly war. In the beginning of the 22d chapter of Matthew there is, in the opening of another parable, the murdering of

several innocent parties under circumstances greatly similar to those in the previous one. This time Christ tells what was done. "The king was wroth, and he sent his armies" (not army), and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city." Here we have the getting angry, the employment of armies, and the destroying with the city, undoubtedly, some too young, and others too feeble, to have done any previous wrong. "The king was wroth." If we do not get angry at wrong, we will lose our moral and religious nature just as much as we will lose them if we do not love peace, and cultivate mercy and forgiveness. That use of armies was a picture of the war through which, the Roman legion, in four years from the year 66 to 70, lost many thousands of soldiers in their various campaigns against the Jewish troops.

Immediately after the last parable, to which reference has been made, from the 15th to end of the 21st verse, is related that incident which led Christ to say "Render therefore, unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." What did, first, the Jewish people, and then the Christian church, regard as "the things of Caesar's"? The reply is that history shows that it meant in addition to prayers or quasi prayers for emperor, people and armies; a paying of taxes, which was partly used for the expenses of war; and in the enforced military service of a certain number from each province in military service. All these things the Jews were bidden to do. From the days of Augustus to the actual commencement of the Jewish revolt, there were daily offered at the temple, two sacrifices, for the emperor and the Roman people, at which were offered two lambs and an ox. Whether, connected with those sacrifices, which the Roman people might think from sacrifices, on heathen altars in behalf of the Roman armies, there were actual prayers for the emperor offered in Palestine, may be doubted. Out of Palestine, however, in every synagogue, prayers were offered weekly for emperor, people and armies. The Jewish population of Judea were, by law, exempted from military service, but elsewhere they were compelled to serve in the army. The exempting power could at any time withdraw the exemption. The taxation in Palestine was very heavy. In St. Augustine's opinion, much of it was used either directly or indirectly, to help in the support of both the Roman legions and the numerous bands of provincial troops. (See Schurer's Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Div. 2, Vol. 1 from P. 278). To the followers of Christ there was always the obedience to the law, written in (Rom. 13:7) down to at least 325 A. D. There was ever a rendering to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom. Prayer for whoever was the emperor is spoken of in about all the Ante-Nicene Apologists. Tertullian, the most rabid denouncer of Christians who became soldiers, in the 30th chapter of his apology says, "For all emperors we pray. We pray for life prolonged, for security to the empire, for protection to the imperial house, for brave armies, for a faithful senate; for the world at rest." The work from which this is taken was written about the year 195. The Greek liturgies which have come down to us are now generally

supposed to have been originally memorized prayers, which with the Creed were never heard by anyone unbaptized. (Harford's Diet. P. B. p. 229). The following is taken from the Liturgy of St. Mark, as translated in the Aute Nicene volume on Liturgies and Documents. Its position is almost preceding the Prayer of Consecration. "We pray and beseech Thee, O Lord, that our king may enjoy long life, and be just and brave. Subdue under him all his adversaries and enemies. Gird on that shield and armor, and come to his aid. Give him the victory, O God, that his heart may be set on peace, and the praise of Thy Holy Name."

American Christians! Copy the spirit shown in this old prayer. Daily pray for VICTORY, because you think, or believe, or know, that your cause is just. Do not ask your maker to protect your loved ones in, as it were, capital letters, while presenting, on the same occasion, a petition for the cause which tore them from you, in the very smallest type. Be equally zealous in your prayers for the safety of those dear to you and for their success. So will you, at home, render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.

During all the Christian centuries, the Christian duty of rendering to Caesar what is Caesar's by all but a few, has been thought to include the duty of military service as well; all the obligation to offer prayers for rulers, and in times of wars, prayers for the success of the army and navy; while bearing increased taxation, is the inevitable accompaniment and consequence of war. But there is another duty which, in modern times, has not been so cheerfully assumed. A consequence of war is spoken of in Rev. 6:6, where, to use understandable English, it is stated that a quart of wheat and three quarts of barley is sold or is to be sold for 17 cents, while the angel is bidden not to touch the olive oil, or the wine. Greater increase in the price of necessities of life that are needed by the many, than in the price of luxuries of life used by the few; great increase in the price of food; little increase in salaries, or wages; that condition, forced upon many, whose support comes from stated incomes—this is a physical evil, which is ever one of the consequences of modern war. Should it ever be met, without the thought that the Providence of God has a great deal to do with the affairs of this life? Ought the cry "Give us peace" be ever for peace because it will add to our comfort? Should it not be met by lowering the standard of living, or as in England, through an increase of bread earners in the family? Should it not be remembered that, in Christ's day, the principal articles of food were barley leaves and dried fish? What grandparents in all of the countries ate 50 years ago, how they dressed, and how they enjoyed life should be remembered. For at least 50 millions in the United States, what they can give to their country as their share in the financing of this war, and how they can unite their sacrifices with those made by soldiers in the trenches, depends entirely upon how they will meet a great change in their economic condition of life due to the difference between earnings and prices of necessities.

That the cry for "peace" which is prompted by the thought of individual discomfort, is not Christ's idea of peace, is proven by his words, in the last verses of this same 22d chapter, in a quotation from the Psalms, which is itself quoted by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15:25: "He must reign until He hath put all His enemies under his feet."

Here we have a ruler at war for as long a time as his enemies are able to escape complete humiliation. They were put under his feet.

Such a spiritual, perhaps symbolie war, was a fitting opening to prophetic teaching of the 24th of Mt., where with its telling of the destruction of Jerusalem as the main topic, that subject seems to have connected with it some account of the end of the world. That war, some 40 years afterwards, was one in which the Jewish people were driven into rebellion by the actions of most of the successors of Pontius Pilate, and especially by the cupidity, craft and cruelty of the last one. Christ wept over what was to be in the future because great buildings would be completely destroyed. He seems, however, to have regarded the war as a necessity. If necessary, that way of war, at least in this case, was in accord with Christ's teaching of the duty of non-resistance and forgiveness of enemies and man's duties to their fellow men. Yet what advance has man ever made in any direction, which has been unassociated with struggles, tears and strife? If there was a necessity for war, then Christ seems to intimate that such necessity will continue. This he taught through Mk. 13, 7 and 8 (R. V.): "When ye hear of wars and rumors of wars, be not troubled." What was to be the reason for their calmness? "These things must needs come to pass. For nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom." Here we have the judgment of the only perfect reader of the future, ignorant of but one fact, as to what is to be expected during an indefinite period of coming time. He anticipates those national troubles and in that anticipation he is the strength of the right, for he is the refuge of all seeking right. Knowledge of all things is with him.

In the Old Testament three of the prophets had spoken of a time when "spears would be turned into pruning hooks." There is no parallel passages or even passage in the New Testament relating to peace coming to communities or existing between kingdoms and nations. The great underlying principle in those Old Testament prophecies is taught by Christ in another way, which is brought out in no place more fully than in the last great discourse, recorded in the gospel written by St. John, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. Not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." "Glory to God in the highest" is not, as in our old Bible version, "and on earth peace, good will towards men," but is, as translated in the revised version "And on earth, Peace among men in whom He is well pleased." That broadening out of the thought of peace may have been the reason why the long discourse in the 14 chapter of the 4th Evangelist ends with the words in Jn. 16:33: "In the world, ye

shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." The discourse was followed by the prayer in the 17th chapter. Fortified by teaching and prayer, just before going out from that Upper Chamber for a little walk to the Mount of Olives, is the probable time when words, which have come down to us in only the 3d gospel, were spoken by Christ. Having asked the apostles whether they lacked anything when he sent them on missionary journeys without either money or the leathern bag to hold provisions, called "scrip", or shoes, their reply was "Nothing." Then said He unto them: "But now let him that hath purse or 'scrip' taken them." And then He added, "And he that hath no sword, let him sell his cloak (R. V.) and buy one." The reason that he gave for this new direction was that his death was near, and all things written of him would be soon accomplished. That reason being given to the apostles, they said: "Lord, behold, here are two swords." And he said unto them: "It is enough," and he came out and went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives and the disciples followed him (Lk. 22:35-39).

The agony in Gethseme followed. That ended, we find, by returning to the first gospel (Mt. 26:46) that Christ said, "Rise, let us be going. And while he yet spake, lo, Judas came, and with him a great multitude, with swords and staves. That multitude, after the leader of the little band had been pointed out, by means of a kiss, came and laid hands on Jesus, and took him." Here (see also Jn. 18:10) Simon Peter drew his sword, which he had probably taken from that Upper Chamber at the implied direction of Christ, and cut off the ear of a servant of the high priest, which the divine healer immediately restored, saying, probably at the same time, to Peter: "Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword." In the book of Rev. 13:7 and 10 in a great war made by the dragon against the saints, it is said that "The patience and faith of the saints is that He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth by the sword, must be killed with the sword." In both places the final sufferers are the aggressors. Who were the aggressors when Christ was arrested? They who came out with swords and the clubs borne by each one of the large temple police force, when they could have arrested him quietly at any time. Christ, in his first teaching, had taught, as we have seen, that to lose life was the way to gain life. On that very week (Jn. 12:24-27) he said that he was about to practice what he preached, and die that he might live. The last persons, who would have been generally deterred from taking the sword, through fear of dying in battle, were the apostles. A panic did overtake those followers, but that desertion and fear, it is implied, was considered by their Master, as a wrong action. "Dying by the sword taken" was a prophetic view of what would be 40 years afterward, when the greatest carnage would be centered at the temple, and where about as many Jewish lives would fall in a civil war "while the enemy was at its gates" as by Roman soldiers. With this he immediately connected another idea of safety. At a time when the regular Roman army consisted of

only 23 legions, all scattered along a boundary frontier of 3,000 miles, no two in peace time, within hundreds of miles of each other, he said: "Thinkest thou that I cannot pray the Father and he shall give me more than 12 legions—more than half of all that regular scattered Roman force, more than 12 legions of angels." That they would then fight successfully for him is proven by their being able to prevent his being taken prisoner. The words are, "But how then, shall the Scripture be fulfilled that thus it must be?" (Mt. 26:53). With different agents as defenders are Christ's assurance of his perfect safety, when in Jn. 19:36, he used the words, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews;" which is the last incident in the gospel relating to war. This reply of Jesus has been used by the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as giving authority to rulers, to call upon subjects for armed forces when national differences between kingdoms of this world demand the use of armies. Who can add any strength to the reasoning. We pass to the epistles.

In the 21 epistles there are between 80 and 90 uses of similes (some many times), founded upon military life or war. These are to be found in every epistle except in the one-chaptered books of 2d and 3d of John and Jude. Even in those three as in all other books in the New Testament, there is the mention of peace which, as it is the antithesis of war, is a quasi military figure. That peace is more than the peace between individuals or nations. For this St. Paul prayed in 2d Thess. 3:16: "Now the Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times in all ways" (R. V.) The A. V. reads "all ways by all means." This is the nearest approximation to those Old Testament prophecies in the New Testament.

Before referring to a few of the most important similes in the epistles, which are apt to be overlooked, I would state that the millions of Christians who use a liturgical service constantly use such a figure when in many different languages they say something similar to "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, or Lord God of Sabbath." In the words the Lord God Almighty is accredited with being the Commander in Chief of large armies, some stationed in the world above, where they have some knowledge of, and some connection with the affairs of this world, while some are in hands of smaller numbers scattered in armies in the world below.

It was to a commander of a very small force that St. Paul wrote when he would keep that one from becoming entangled with the affairs of the world by reminding him (2 Tim. 2:4) that he was "called to be a soldier." The same writer calls both Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25) and Archippus in the 2d verse in Philemon "fellow soldiers." How many times is the "good fight" alluded to? How many times are 4 or 5 different adversaries mentioned. "Crowns" are not the diadems of royalty but were the garlands, put on the brows of valiant soldiers, by the victorious general. Triumph and victory, and capture, and such like figures meant far more to the contemporaries of the

apostles than they can ever mean to us. At the head of a long procession of troops comes the triumphant army, armed with spears and sword. Before fighting for months they had been taught by hard work and drill to fight lawfully, to know when the trumpet gave the sound to prepare for battle, how to put on the armor. How many times had each soldier been left to watch. How many times had his captain bidden him to stand firm, or to be strong, steadfast, never giving an inch to the enemy, by being unmovable. All had endured many hardships and sometimes had been defeated. Their troubles, trials and suffering were then all forgotten for every soldier had been given a donative. Then came "spoils" of the conquered country. The triumphant general in a chariot soon appears with his private guards. Back of all that was a man loaded with chains, who had been either the ruler or the general of the conquered country. After the triumphant march he will privately be deapitated. The unnumbered thousands in the "captured" army followed. They were not to be soon sent back to their country. They were the property of the "conquerors." Some were to be trained to "fight with men and beast." Very many were to be sent to work in the royal mines, where the conditions of life were so unfavorable and deaths so many that there was always a dearth of workers. The rest were to be sold to slave buyers. "Redemption" meant the restoring of such captives to liberty, home and relatives, by paying down the price. Under such similes the author of that classic song of charity in the 13th chapter of 1 Cor. and others taught newly made Christians their duties.

The epistle to the Hebrew is now generally considered to be written by one of Paul's pupils. When its unknown author would spur his readers to aspire, through sense of forgiveness and "redemption" to the high duty of "overcoming" their "besetting sins" he does it with the words "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin" (Heb. 12:4), where the figure is that of a soldier engaged in mortal conflict ready to lay down his own life while prepared under orders to take life. Can we think that Christians would be bidden in so many ways to take the fighting soldier as their model, and from him learn to fight manfully against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier until life's end, if war were wrong? Such similes, in such numbers and in so many different relationships to the Christian life, do convincingly lead to the conclusion that the apostles regarded the military life, in its general features, as a commendatory one. We pass to that book of "Revelation" which St. Jerome thought "was as full of mystery as it was of words." It commences with a greeting of peace from him "who was, and is, and is to come," by St. John, to the churches of Asia. Casting down our eyes, to the 16th verse, we read that out of the mouth of the Son of Man (13th v.) "there went a two-edged sword." This picture is a warlike one. From the 6th chapter to the end it principally deals with war. Remembering that as early as about the year 400, one who from its pages declared, that the end of the world was at hand, because this statement meant this event and that

person without doubt could only mean that individual, was warned by one of the greatest Christian scholars and thinkers that its author ought to put his conclusions so mildly, that if time showed any falsity, men should cease to blame "God's word", we do not try to explain meanings on account of that warning.

What is stated about war will be treated simply as true events. Assuming that both of the two holy wars spoken in the work had, for excitor, the powers of heaven, let us turn to the 6th chapter to see how they prepared for war. "Armed with a bow the first horseman went forth, conquering and to conquer;" (6:2) "the second to take peace from the earth (4 v.); the third, to create a scarcity of food, which would be especially felt by the common people, and the fourth called 'death to kill, by the sword, by hunger and by the beasts of the earth.' " I believe that the above description was recorded by the same St. John who wrote (1 Jn. 4:8): "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love." Love without necessary punishment is not love. The punishment must be adapted to and be suitable for obtaining the end sought, not only in the individual, but also in the individuals living in communities with other beings. Christ represents forgiveness in a parable (Mt. 18:23-35). After a great king had forgiven a servant, who owed 10,000 talents, that servant went out and threw into prison a fellow servant who only owed 100 pence. The final action of the great merciful king, personifying mercy itself, in order to teach forgiveness is represented as angry, and orders the former forgiven great debtor to be delivered to tormentors, until he should pay all that is due him. After those horsemen departed on their war march the souls of those under the altar, who had been slain for the word of God, cried "How long dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." They were bidden to wait until all the number should be filled of persons so killed. The horsemen would soon be successful. Before them even the great powers of earth hid themselves with trembling.

This was an aggressive war, a punitive war and a defensive war to protect from abuse the living saints. In God's own war, varied but wisely collected forces were sent out to do extensive damage to the enemy, and we have here, cries for vengeance and retaliation coming from saints in Paradise, who were as well informed as any living Christians could be, of Christ's axiom in Mt. 5:44, "But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you, and persecute you." and who were better able than those living in this sinful world to resist evil, if evil it be, such cries and feeling, some of the earth's saints would condemn in some Belgian orphan, or in those in some undefended village in England who were seriously injured by bombs from airships. Those unreprieved cries in heaven should, I think, at least if they come from victims of unlawful warlike acts, compel us to stop and think, whether there be not very good Christianity in the feelings and cries, and prayers for ven-

geance of such victims of earthly unlawfulness and cruelty. War has its own laws.

In the 12th chapter, the account of a second war which might be called a defensive one, is commenced, and is carried forward to the end of the 18th chapter. Probably to account for a new personage called in the 3d verse a "great red dragon," in the 7th verse there comes a kind of parenthesis, which is introduced by the words "there was a war in heaven, Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought him and his angels." When we find that a Christian book recognized that at some time, the necessity of war was felt in heaven and the necessity of the angels carrying it on in such a way and at such a sacrifice, that it is said of Michael's forces "that they loved not their lives unto death" (11 v.), is there not a presumptive proof that in the more wicked earthly world there must be such a necessity recognized and blessed by the creator, through help to the righteous cause? This war in heaven seems only indirectly connected with God's second war. The end of this last war was so great a destruction of a very large and very wealthy city, called "Babylon," that not a light from one candle could be seen shining in all its vast ruins.

In both wars all the gigantic resources of nature were concentrated to carry forward with a resolute, inflexible, ruthless, persevering effort and sacrifice, the determination to fight, until all the friends of cruelty, dishonesty, lying, licentiousness and lawlessness—who are all represented as having headquarters in that Babylon—should be completely overcome. When that was done, there was nothing left to do but to bind Satan for another thousand years, and to praise God for his goodness, because, through war, some of the influences of evils were lessened.

The inferred consent of God to war, the blessing conferred through war, the methods of wars, and the object aimed at in war, can all be learned from studying the book of Revelation.

Our examination of the whole of the New Testament, not for proof texts, of which there are none, pro or con, but for incidents and statements bearing upon the teachings of Christ, gathered from the four gospels, from the writings of the apostles, and from the last book in the Bible, has been completed.

To any interested in studying the relation of Christianity to war during the period between the years 100 and 325, the reading of twelve pages on "The Spread of Christianity in the Army" in the 2d volume of Harnack's "The Mission and Expansion of Christianity," commencing with the fifty-second page of the English translation, together with the two articles in Smith and Cheetham's *Christian Antiquities* on "Military Service" and on "War" with the reading of pages 185 and 186 of the volume of "Tertullian", in "The Library of the Fathers", if that is joined to looking through the first volume of the English translation of Hefele's "Councils" will give a very interesting view of both the opinion of several Christian writers on war in the abstract, and the religious difficulties which beset Christians when they were serving in pagan armies.

When Constantine the Great, in the year 312, after probably seeing some vision or having some dream, before going into battle removed the imperial eagle, which was perched at the top of the royal standard, and substituted for it the Christian monogram enclosed in a wreath, by that act, as he was ever a politician, virtually announced to the world that a large majority of his soldiers were either Christians or at least had friendly feelings for that religion. By the year 324 when, after another successful battle, he announced that he believed in Christ, all the most objectionable features of the pagan army life had probably been quietly dropped. That veneration for the standard of the army, independent of thought of what was on it to the Roman soldier, probably remained the chief article of his belief for many years. By about the year 380 that opinion had been greatly modified. When about that year St. Ambrose blessed the Christian standard, called "The Labarum" in the first Christian prayer before it was borne into battle, his prayer was, "Turn, O Lord, and raise the standard of thy faith. Here it is not the eagles nor the flight of birds, that lead the army, but thy name, and thy worship." (These words are quoted with many pictures of the Monogram and Labarum in Art. "Laharum" in Christ Antiq.) As the first Christian prayer for an army recorded in History these words are a fitting introduction to the many references to war by Ambrose's greater contemporary, St. Augustine, which have been scattered in the works of the latter, translated into English in the fifteen volumes edited by Marcus Dods. There are references to war from the standpoint which is being considered in three of his epistles, as also in his "City of God" and in his answer to Festus the Manichean in the volume devoted to that heresy. Taken as a whole, there will be found several references to Christ's silence as to the soldiers' occupation and to the duty of military service which was enjoined through the command "to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." There is one slight reference to the command to buy a sword, and to the words taking and perishing by the sword, having a reference to the armed crowd, who came out to arrest Jesus. While in his exposition on the Sermon on the Mount, there were not found references to war, in those other places above mentioned, that sermon was frequently referred to. He considers frequently the words of Christ in that sermon as being not strictly condemnatory of war, but as hortatory to the spirit of peace, and as a caution against cultivating the spirit of mere retaliation or revenge. (See epistle 130 to Marcellinus.)

The epistle numbered 189 is addressed to Count Boniface, who with a small force was ineffectually trying to check a large horde of heathen, who were overrunning the North of Africa. Augustine tells that commander that everyone has his own gift. Some fight for God, he says, by prayer, others by arms. "Remember, when you huckle on your armor, whose you are. Your strength, and courage, and life are from God. War is a thing of necessity. Peace a thing of desire. You do not seek for peace in order to make war, but you seek for peace by war." Then Augustine, knowing the temptation of the army, adds:

"Be chaste, faithful to your wife; be sober, be frugal. Shame it is to conquer men, and be conquered by lust." The 220th epistle was addressed to the same Count Boniface whom the Bishop of Hippo reproves for his social infidelity. The Bishop tells his correspondent that camp life does not release anyone from any obedience to any command of God. As the writer in his previous letter had bidden his reader to remember the words, "Blessed are the peace makers," undoubtedly, I think all the brotherly kindness which can be cultivated in many different ways in active service, from what can be done in days of peace, was in the good saint's thoughts, when as he knew, he was near to death.

The Manicheans believed that the God of the Old Testament was not the same God that was worshiped by the followers of Christ. As an argument for that belief, Faustus, one of their great teachers and writers, had brought as proof the cruelties which the Jews inflicted on their enemies at the command of God. In the 74th and 75th chapters of the 22d book of Augustine's answer to Faustus he meets that argument, and after so doing writes: "What is the evil in war? Is it in the death of someone (who will soon die in any case) that others may live in peaceful subjection?" This is merely cowardly dislike, not religious feeling. The real evils in war, in his opinion, are love of violence, revengeful cruelty, fierce and implacable enmity, wild resistance, lust of power, and such like feelings and actions; generally it is to punish them that in obedience to God, or to some lawful authority, that good men undertake wars.

The natural order which it seems the peace of mankind ordains is that the monarch should have the power of undertaking war if he thinks it advisable. Even the wars which arise from human passion cannot hurt God's saints, for in the trial of their patience and in the chastening of their spirit, they are benefited. In some cases it is plainly the will of God that men should fight, and in others where it is not so plain, and there may come some command to a soldier, to do something that he would not otherwise do as a soldier, under authority, he must obey orders. He is innocent of any wrong-doing. The commander alone is to blame. The soldier ought to trace back his act to the will of God, who placed him in a situation where he must so act. The same kind of an argument is used by Augustine in the 20th chapter of the 1st book of the treatise called "City of God," when writing of the taking of life in battle. He who then takes life should not think of himself or be thought by others as being a homicide, because that death of an enemy was the natural result of circumstances, which God alone controlled. During succeeding centuries it is said that very little was added respecting the morality of war to the view of Augustine. Excepting the Crusades, most of the greater wars were those between Christian powers and some hordes of at best half-Christianized, semi-civilized nations or Islam invaders. There were many squabbles and few wars of long duration, between Christian nations for over 1,000 years after 400 A. D. But what does the religious life of our own times say about war? We shall first give the whole of a short section relating to the

right of war, because it is always best to see all sides of every question. It is taken from a portion of an unsigned article in "McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia on War." It reads: "Such a course of action as war, involving, as it does, not only the immense destruction of life and property, but also the ruin and misery of helpless and innocent families, cannot, for a moment, be reconciled with the principles of philanthropy, much less with the principles of Christianity, which teach universal love and beneficence. To justify such conduct from considerations of person, local or temporary advantage, is 'to do evil that good may come,' which is condemned in Rom. 3:8. Casuists throw the responsibility on the ruling power, but then it could direct idolatry or the people to commit any enormity. The will of a majority under a republican government makes no difference in responsibility. Each man must act, act for himself, in the fear of God."

As a foil to the above, in conclusion I shall give an abstract of four of the heads of an article on War which is to be read in the last volume of "The Catholic Encyclopedia." Its author was Charles Macksey, Professor of Ethics in the Gregorian University at Rome. Its views fill six long columns. Every word deserving of study.

(1) Every perfect right, to be efficacious and real implies the right to defend itself. This right, however, is limited. The use of force must be necessary, and damages must not be inflicted by it, beyond measure. The settlement of these questions must be left to the State. To permit thousands of individuals to be witness, judge and executioner, would work injustice. The State has full right to declare war, whether it be an offensive, defensive or punitive one.

(2) The source of the Right of War is in the natural law, which confers upon States, the use of means, for the accomplishment of the purposes for which the State exists. The original determination of the right of war, comes from nature only, and not from the consent of mankind.

(3) The Possessor of the Right of War. Coercive right belongs to the possessor or natural guardian of those rights, because there is no higher authority, to which appeal can be made.

(4) Title and Purpose of War. Its primary title comes in three ways (a) that its State rights are menaced by foreign aggression, not otherwise to be prevented except by force, (b) or to punish for such action, or (c) to obtain security from such action in the future. The State is, therefore, the only judge which is to decide whether its rights have been menaced by foreign aggression; whether those offenses are reparable only by the use of force; and whether success through victory is an absolute need for the obtaining security for the future. In addition to a primary title to declare war, the State can acquire a secondary title. This comes through the request of an innocent weak state, which is being injured by some stronger power. When charity hears the call of injured weakness, the State may

exert extreme coercion in its behalf. Before a State should allow itself to declare war, under either title, it should weigh well the thought that in the calm forum of deliberate reason, the loss of a single life outweighs the mere offended vanity of either king or people.

With this brief abstract of an article well worthy of hours of study, we close. When Christians search the Scripture to find out how God acts, even now when he punishes severely and unmercifully the unmerciful servants to force them and others to exercise mercy and forgiveness; when they remember that at Christ's first appearance in public, he was such a fighter, that he seemed to his apostles to be the one who was spoken of in the verse in the Psalms, where it was written: "The zeal for thine house hath eaten me up (Jn. 2:17); when they replace in their valuation of their refinement, culture, wealth and life, the values which Christ placed upon them; when forgiveness and redemption will not so much suggest the thought of happiness and security in the next world as it does the obligation resting upon them, to win, through God's help, the next spiritual battle with their beloved sins, even though that conflict costs them the loss of a quasi eye, or hand, or limb, or even life itself; there will be fewer pacifists in the world. Then it would be acknowledged that the universal feeling in the hearts of almost 100 million peaceful men, that those actions of injustice, dishonor, falsity, and cruelty inflicted on their nation must be stopped by force of arms is not only a right natural feeling, but also that the idea of using compelling force as a restraining means, has the sanction of God, and is along the line on which Christ acted on earth, and along those lines which are mapped out in Revelations.

It is true "that the loss of one life outweighs the mere wounded vanity of kings and people." But that universal agreement on the part of 20 nations on four continents as to unjust actions suffered by each one cannot be called vanity. If Christian bigness trusting to its universal army service, and also in the idea that it is the champion rodent of the world, and can build trenches from which it can be driven only inch by inch; if on account of that power and that protection, bigness can do as it pleases, and be a law unto itself then the loss of even a million of lives, divided among five or six armies, would not be too great a sacrifice to pay, to teach through the loss of so many of the items of life falling on that one Big Strength through its weakening power felt during after centuries, that justice, righteousness and equity are equally God attributes as love is, and are all attributes governed by love and all used in return in determining what is love, while the thought of loss would only force from saddened hearts the words, "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

